



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,362	02/14/2002	Alexander Druyan	AUS920011019USI	1508

7590	11/15/2007
------	------------

Darcell Walker
 8107 Carvel Lane
 Houston, TX 77036

EXAMINER	
DESHPANDE, KALYAN K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/076,362
Filing Date: February 14, 2002
Appellant(s): DRUYAN ET AL.

MAILED

NOV 15 2007

GROUP 3600

Darcell Walker
Reg. No. 34,945
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 10, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed October 27, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

This appeal involves claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-28.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2003/0126001

Northcutt et al.

12-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030126001).

As per claim 1, Northcutt et al. teach:

A method for displaying a list of service requests from multiple service request systems on a single display comprising the steps of:

receiving a service inquiry at a service manager location (see ¶ 65; where a work management person receives a service request.);

formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of persons from the service manager (see ¶¶ 50-51, 54-56, 60-62, and 65-67; where a status code is created or updated for a service request. The status of a service request is sent to the appropriate persons.);

receiving and merging responses to the service request status message from service ticketing systems into a single list of responses (see ¶ 72 and figure 17; where a summary of all of the service requests analysis and status are received and viewed.);

sorting the tickets in the response list by predetermined parameters and generating a sorted ticket request list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where the tickets are displayed in a list with several parameters presented. A user can sort the lists by clicking on one of the field headers.); and

displaying the sorted ticket request list containing ticket request from multiple ticket request systems (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where the tickets are displayed in a list with several parameters presented. A user can sort the lists by clicking on one of the field headers.).

Northcutt et al. fail to explicitly teach sending service requests status to a plurality of service ticketing systems. A plurality of service ticketing systems is defined as a plurality of interfaces to retrieve ticket request information (see Specification pages 11-12). Northcutt et al. teach a plurality of interfaces that can be used to retrieve, view, modify or edit service requests (see ¶¶ 53-55 and 59-63; where a plurality of interfaces available to users is described. Each interface enables different types of users to access information in a format most appropriate for their role. Each interface receives and displays information.). Furthermore, Northcutt et al. teach sending service requests status (see ¶¶ 65-67; where upon submission of a service request, the service request is sent to a service request manager via email. The IT person responsible can update any of the submitted fields, including the service request status.). Thus, Northcutt et al. disclose sending service requests status and a plurality of interfaces (i.e. a plurality of service ticketing systems). The advantage of sending service requests status to a plurality of service ticketing systems is that it enables users to view updated data and

changes made to data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of sending service request status to a plurality of service ticketing systems in order to enable users to view updated data and changes made to service request data, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶¶ 5-6).

As per claim 2, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of converting the service status request message to a format for each particular ticketing system (see ¶ 52; where service requests are placed into an XML or HTML format for each interface used by the users.).

As per claim 3, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of converting the responses from the plurality of ticketing systems into a common format for receipt and processing by the service manager (see ¶ 52; where service requests are placed into an XML or HTML format for each interface used by the users, including the service manager.).

As per claims 4, Northcutt et al. fail to teach the "sorted list is stored in cache memory". It is old and well-known in the art to store temporary data in cache memory. The advantage of storing sorted lists in cache memory is that it enables users to sort the same data in multiple ways. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to store sorted lists in cache memory in order to allow users to sort the same data in multiple ways, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶ 6).

As per claim 5, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises creating multiple sorted lists (see ¶ 6; where users can generate reports that sort data in multiple ways.).

Claim 5 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 4; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 6, Northcutt et al. fail to teach the steps of “creating an integer array”, “comparing tickets in a response list in a one-to-one format using pre-determined parameters”, “directing a next free pointer in the array to a next ticket in a response list in an order as that results from the comparison”, and “storing a sorted response list in the cache memory”. It is old and well-known in the art to create an integer array, compare pre-determined parameters of input data, and sort the data based on the comparison of pre-determined parameters. The advantage of completing these steps is that it allows for the sorting of data based on any of the available pre-determined parameters. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the steps to create an integer array, compare pre-determined parameters of input data, and sort the data based on the comparison to the sorting feature of the Northcutt et al system in order to allow for the sorting of data based on any of the available pre-determined parameters, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶ 6).

Claim 6 further recites the limitation of “storing this list in the cache memory” which is addressed by the rejection of claim 4; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 7, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises:
determining whether a sort map exist for a service ticket list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are available to users to display service request data. A report maps corresponding database fields to report fields when generating a report. Therefore, a pre-defined report is the same as a sort map.); and
displaying sorted tickets based on a sort from a preexisting sort map (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are displayed to the users.).

As per claim 8, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises:
determining whether a sort map exist for a service ticket list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are available to users to display service request data. A report maps corresponding database fields to report fields when generating a report. Therefore, a pre-defined report is the same as a sort map.); and
creating a sort map when there is a determination that no sort map exist (see ¶ 59; where users can manipulate existing reports to create a desired report. Manipulating an existing report is the same as creating a sort map.).

As per claim 9, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of:
determining the elapsed time since the last inquiry by a particular service technician (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a report can be generated based on the status of a service ticket assigned to him.); and

resetting the ticket lists in the cache, if a predetermined time period has expired (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a user can modify a displayed report or generate a new report. The modification or generation of a new report re-queries the database for and pulls new data in to the cache as described by the rejection of claim 4.).

As per claim 10, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 9 wherein said resetting step comprises retrieving additional tickets for the ticketing systems (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a user can modify a displayed report or generate a new report. The modification or generation of a new report re-queries the database for and pulls new data in to the cache as described by the rejection of claim 4.).

As per claim 11, Northcutt et al. teach:

A method for displaying a list of service requests from multiple service request systems on a single display comprising the steps of:

determining whether a list of tickets currently exist for an inquiring service technician (see ¶ 61; where a report can be generated based on the assigned IT personnel.);

sorting the tickets in the response list by pre-determined parameters and generating a sorted ticket request list (see ¶¶ 59-60; where users can sort based on any of the pre-determined parameters.); and

displaying the sorted ticket request list containing ticket request from multiple ticket request systems (see ¶¶ 59-61 and figures 23-24; where the sorted lists are displayed.).

Claim 11 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claim 1 and 6; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

Claim 13 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 8; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

Claims 14-28 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1-13 and further recite a computer program product and a system which are taught by Northcutt et al. (see ¶¶ 51-53 and figure 2; where a system is taught. The system further has a workflow management system which is a computer program product.); therefore the same rejections of claims 1-13 apply to claims 14-28 as well.

(10) Response to Argument

In the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues the following:

Northcutt fails to teach "formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of service ticketing systems from the service manager". Appellants specifically argue the present invention is distinguished in that it uses a plurality of service ticketing systems and the location to which the "service request status message" is going to is different than Northcutt. Examiner does not find these arguments persuasive because 1) Appellants are arguing limitations and features that are not recited in the claims and 2) the argued claim limitation, construed under the broadest reasonable interpretation, is obvious in light of Northcutt.

1. Appellants arguments rely on features and limitations not recited in the claims.

Examiner notes that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Appellants argue several limitations and features not found in the claims. Specifically, Appellants arguments rely on a "gateway manager" / "gateway adapters" (see Appeal Brief page 6), "remote or distributed locations" (see Appeal Brief page 6), "backend-ticketing system...have various formats such as a single connections database or a Java database format" (see Appeal Brief page 6), and "service request information for each system is stored remotely in that system and then retrieved as requested by the gateway manager" (see Appeal Brief page 7). Appellants are arguing these features in order to draw the distinction that the architecture of the present invention is distinguished from Northcutt. However, Examiner maintains that these structures are not recited in the claims. Appellants broadly recite the functionality of the system without any limitations as to what structures are required to perform the functionality. Even if the claims were construed to include the non-recited features, the configuration of the present invention would still be obvious in light of Northcutt. With the structural limitations, Appellants would merely be arguing spreading the functionality Of Northcutt's server to several machines, which is within ordinary skill in the art. As such, Appellants arguments reciting limitations and features not found in the recited claims are irrelevant and not found persuasive.

2. The "formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of service ticketing systems from the service manager" limitation, construed under the broadest reasonable interpretation, are obvious in light of the teachings of Northcutt.

Under the simplest and broadest reasonable interpretation, a plurality of ticketing systems can be construed to mean a general method of viewing ticketing information incorporating different systems, where a system is merely any machine. Examiner submits that Examiner's interpretation that different users that are presented with distinguishing information constitute different systems. As such, Northcutt et al. teach a plurality of interfaces that can be used to retrieve, view, modify or edit service requests (see ¶¶ 53-55 and 59-63; where a plurality of interfaces available to users is described. Each interface enables different types of users to access information in a format most appropriate for their role. Each interface receives and displays information.). Appellants argue that a plurality of ticketing systems are independent ticketing systems such as Help Desk or CRM systems (see Appeal Brief page 6), however, no such requirement is found in the claims. Appellants define "a plurality of service ticketing systems" as a plurality of interfaces to retrieve ticket request information (see Specification pages 11-12). Thus, Examiner submits that Examiner's interpretation of the claim language is reasonable.

Northcutt further teaches sending service requests status (see ¶¶ 65-67; where upon submission of a service request, the service request is sent to a service request manager via email. The IT person responsible can update any of the submitted fields, including the service request status.). Appellants confusingly argue that the present

invention requires that this step "is making a request" whereas in Northcutt the request "is a response to a previously received inquiry" (see Appeal Brief page 7). Examiner maintains that this is the same thing. If a previously received inquiry exists, the inquiry must have been made at some point. Appellants even further argue that the present invention is distinguished based on this limitation because of the location of where the status inquiry is going is different from Northcutt. However, in both inventions, the status inquiry is sent to the ticketing systems and the response from the systems is directed back to the manager drawing up the status reports (see ¶¶ 61, 65-67). Thus, the functionality of a manager sending an inquiry to the system is in both invention, and Northcutt goes one step further in rendering a report to the manager based on the inquiry.

Thus, Appellants argument that Northcutt fails to teach "formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of service ticketing systems from the service manager" is not found persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Application/Control Number:
10/076,362
Art Unit: 3623

Page 13


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Kalyan Deshpande
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623

Conferees:



Alexander G. Kalinowski
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3691



Romain Jeanty
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623